

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 were pending at the time the Office Action was mailed on May 7, 2007.

Claims 1-24 are presently canceled.

Claims 25-48 are added as new claims.

Accordingly, claims 25-48 remaining pending.

### **Amendment to the Specification**

The Office Action directed that the cross-references to the patent applications incorporated by reference should be updated. In the foregoing “Amendment to the Specification,” Applicants have provided a replacement paragraph to update these references. Applicants submit that the replacement paragraph should address the Office Action’s directive.

### **Objection to the Abstract**

The Office Action objected to the Abstract because it exceeded 150 words in length. Applicants submit that the foregoing “Replacement Abstract,” having 148 words, resolves the objection stated in the Office Action.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Practically, the rejections of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 1-4. However, in the interest of advancing prosecution, applicants wish to indicate how newly added claims resolve this rejection.

Specifically, the Office Action rejected claims 1-3, which included claims directed to a “computer-readable medium,” “as not being tangible because the software program product

claims do not require use of a hardware computer to perform, and would not result in a practical application producing a useful, concrete, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.”

Applicants submit that new claims 41 and 45, which also are directed to computer-readable media, overcome any such rejection. In pertinent part, both claims 41 and 45 recite “A computer-readable storage medium storing instructions executable by a computer system to yield a result.” Respectfully, claims 41 and 45 and their respective dependent claims do involve the use of a computer to yield the result recited in the limitations of the respective claims. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are not applicable to the newly submitted claims.

### **Rejections for Double-Patenting**

Practically, the rejections of claims 1-24 for judicially-created, nonstatutory double-patenting are rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 1-24. However, in the interest of advancing prosecution, applicants wish to indicate how newly added claims resolve this rejection.

Claims 1-24 are provisionally rejected on the basis of judicially-created, nonstatutory double-patenting:

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both computer systems comprise substantially the same elements. The difference between claims 1-5 of the copending application and this case are XML schema validation. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill level in the art to include a XML schema validation since it was well known at the time of the invention to avoid errors occurred during inserting the information into the document.”

(Office Action, Pages 3-4). Respectfully, applicants submit that this rejection is not applicable to new claims 25-48.

The new claims 25-48 recite computer-implemented methods and computer-readable media directed to particular ways of allowing for one programming object to communicate with an application program or second programming object that includes an XML schema validation model. Claims 25-48 recite specific methods or media reciting how the communication is effected to allow the modification of the XML schema validation model of the second programming object. Because the claims are directed to these modifications, as further described below, and not simply to including “XML schema validation,” applicants submit the claims are patentably distinct from the claims of the co-pending patent application cited.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The rejections of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 1-24. However, in the interest of advancing prosecution, applicants wish to respond to the rejections based on the cited references. Specifically, applicants respectfully assert that the primary reference, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0145197 A1 of Lee et al. (Lee), fails to support the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at least two reasons.

First, Lee does not teach the application of a modification to an XML schema validation model as recited in the claims. Lee teaches “inserting illegitimate change detecting information into [a] corresponding web resource, wherein the illegitimate change detecting information is used to detect whether or not the web resource is changed illegitimately; and a web resource change detecting subsystem for judging whether or not the corresponding web resource is

illegitimately changed.” (Lee, Paragraph [0008], Lines 4-10). In other words, Lee teaches only a binary system for determining whether the resource is legitimate or has been tampered with illegitimately.

By contrast, independent claims 25, 41, and 45 each recite applying a modification to an XML schema validation model. Pertinent sections of claims 25, 41, and 45 are reproduced below for the convenience of the Examiner:

25. (New) A computer-implemented method, comprising:  
providing access to an extensible markup language (XML) schema validation model of an application program to modify the XML schema validation model as the XML schema validation model will be applied to one or more XML documents to be submitted to the application program . . . .

41. (New) A computer-readable storage medium storing instructions executable by a computer system to yield a result, comprising instructions to:  
provide a programmable object model allowing a first programming object to apply a modification to an Extensible Markup Language (XML) schema validation model of a second programming object, wherein the XML schema validation model is configured to validate one or more XML documents according to one or more available XML schemas . . . .

45. (New) A computer-readable storage medium storing instructions executable by a computer system to yield a result, comprising instructions to:  
provide an interface to an XML schema validation model associated with a programming object to receive a modification to one or more XML schemas to be used by the XML schema validation model presented to validate one or more XML documents presented to the programming object . . . .

Because Lee fails to recite the application of a modification to an XML schema validation, Lee fails to teach or suggest what is recited by independent claims 25, 41, and 45.

Second, respectfully, Lee cannot support a *prima facie* rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) because the Office Action fails to show how Lee teaches or suggests all of the limitations of the claims. It is given that “To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 2143.03 (citations omitted). Lee fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of the pending claims.

For example, in rejecting previously pending claim 1, the Office Action relied on Lee as teaching:

[T]he invention substantially as claimed including: An application programming interface (the analyzing/processing unit 150 is called, para [0032], ln 1-3, a user (user, para [0032], ln 1-3), the schema validation system (the analyzing/processing unit 150 calls the illegitimate change detecting file generating unit 160, para [0032], ln 1-3 and ln 17-22), an application programming interface **for allowing a user to programmatically access the functionality of the schema validation system**( para[0032], ln 1-4 and ln 17-22)

(Office Action, Page 4, Third Full Paragraph; emphasis added). The Office Action thus relies upon paragraph [0032] lines 1-4 and 17-22 as reciting the application programming interface, the schema validation system, and the fact that the application programming interface allows the user programmatically access the functionality of the schema validation system.

Respectfully, however, neither the cited portions of paragraph [0032] nor any part of paragraph [0032] offer such teachings:

**[0032] In other words, the web resource analyzing/processing unit 150 is called from the user interface unit 110 and analyzes the web page selected by the user. As an analysis result, the web resource analyzing/processing unit 150 displays the resources linked to the corresponding web page to the user. Also, the web resource analyzing/processing unit 150 receives from the user interface unit 110 to which resource the illegitimate change detecting information process is performed and to which resource the encryption is applied, and calls the ciphertext generating unit 130 and the digital signature generating unit 140.**

Therefore, the web resource analyzing/processing unit 150 performs the encryption of a specific resource and an insertion of the illegitimate change detecting information, and generates the link of the illegitimate change detecting information constituted with the XML digital signature at the selected web page (e.g., index.html). Thereafter, the web resource analyzing/processing unit 150 calls the illegitimate change detecting file (checksum file) generating unit 160 and allow the illegitimate change detecting file (checksum file) generating unit 160 to generate the checksum of corresponding directory of the web server.

(Lee, Paragraph [0032]; emphasis added to show lines 1-4 and 17-22 as they appear in the published document). Respectfully, it is not clear how this paragraph teaches or suggests the application programming interface, the schema validation system, and how this teaches a user being able to programmatically access the functionality of the schema validation system. Applicants submit that the Office Action and its reliance on this paragraph of the reference fail to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness.


Furthermore, in addition to these shortcomings of the Lee reference, applicants submit that while Lee fails to support the rejection of the previously-pending claims, Lee certainly fails to teach or suggest what the new claims recite. For example, instead of claim 1's recitation of "an application programming interface for allowing a user to programmatically access the functionality of the schema validation system," claim 25 recites "providing access to an extensible markup language (XML) schema validation model of an application program to modify the XML schema validation model as the XML schema validation model will be applied to one or more XML documents to be submitted to the application program." Thus, applicants submit that new claims 25-48 are patentable over the references cited with regard to the previously presented claims.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicants at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Frank J. Bozzo  
Registration No. 36,756  
Direct Dial: 206.342.6294

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P. O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
206.342.6200

